

look to program reform that is both realistic and puts principles and values back into our families.

The Deal substitute, which I helped to write and cosponsor, puts more people to work than the current system, while making it possible for people to find a job and stay in it. We offer more job training and more child care than the status quo, and for the first time we set a lifetime limit of 2 years on welfare.

Your choices are simple, if you look beyond party lines. Put more people to work in less time, or put fewer people to work over more years. Put these options with another favorite theme, greater State flexibility, and you have an even easier choice.

The substitute that will be offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL], myself, and other conservative Democrats allows States to tailor welfare to fit their needs. We give States the option of denying benefits to teenage mothers, we let the States decide whether to continue giving more money to mothers who have more children while on welfare. We also let States decide whether they want to keep people in welfare programs for a additional 2 years under community service. And we give them the option of recycling a few needy people back into the welfare rolls after their time limit has expired.

We are also the only plan that dedicates the moneys that we save to deficit reduction. You will hear more about our plan and the differences between the Deal substitute and the other welfare reform plans that are offered. I encourage you to think of your constituents before your party identification and to look at the reality of our plan and what it does for the future not only for us, for this country but for our children and our children's children.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time remaining to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. DOOLITTLE). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. SHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, in listening to the debate from this side of the aisle, you would think that one of the words that really sticks in my head was one of the speakers, the gentlewoman from Illinois, for whom I have a great deal of respect, referred to our idea as something having to do with Attila the Hun. I hear the gentleman from Tennessee refer to us as mean. And I hear the other speakers refer to us as being tough on children and weak on work.

I would notice, however, a resounding silence in this Hall when it comes to anybody defending the system that we have today, defending the system that we were unable and unwilling to change while the Democrats controlled this body.

You look back at some of the good welfare proposals that have come down the pike, some that really helped. Take the earned income tax credit. That was a Republican proposal. Take the child care that has been put in place. And remember the great fight that we had with the committee, and we worked together on that particular bill. That was bipartisan in nature, and it was signed into law by a Republican President.

Now the time has come to change the balance of the program, to change, truly change welfare as we know it today. For the Republicans to carry forward, to fulfill the 1992 platform pledge of the Democrat Party.

□ 1600

This is the Republicans carrying through on the pledge of the Democrats because of the Democrats' failure to do this. We are going to, I hope and pray that we do pass a welfare bill, that we get rid of the cruelest system that has ever been known.

The cruelest system that is out here on the floor is existing law and we must change it, we must work together, we must move this process forward.

We have worked long and hard on the Republican side in order to change welfare. The bill of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL], which will I understand be offered as a substitute sometime later this week, that bill itself comes a long way from where the Democrat party was just a few short months ago when we could not get a bill to the floor, when we could not reform welfare.

A few short months ago in the last years when the Democrats were in charge, we would have been glad to come forward and work on a bill such as that. But I tell all of my colleagues to read it carefully; come in with specifics. The Republican bill is weak on work? Read the Deal bill. The Republican bill is the bill that stands for work. It stands for real reform and it stands for the empowerment of people.

Let us break the chains of slavery that we have created with welfare in this country and let us work together for a better America.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. McDERMOTT. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOOLITTLE). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, does the rule we have just adopted make in order general debate on H.R. 4 or H.R. 1214?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rule makes in order debate on H.R. 4.

Mr. McDERMOTT. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the committees of jurisdiction reported out three other bills, none of which is before the House today. Am I correct that H.R. 4 has not been reported out by any committee of jurisdiction?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, continuing that inquiry, is it true that the Budget Act points of order which are designed to assure that the budget rules we established for ourselves are adhered to apply only to measures that have been reported by the committee of jurisdiction?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair observes that sections 302, 303, 311, 401, and 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 all establish points of order against the consideration of bills or joint resolutions as reported. That is, in each case the point of order against consideration operates with respect to the bill or joint resolution in its reported state. Thus, in the case of an unreported bill or joint resolution, such a point of order against consideration is inoperative.

Mr. McDERMOTT. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if we had followed the regular order and reported either H.R. 4 or H.R. 1214 from the committees of jurisdiction, several points of order would have applied. To get around those rules, the majority has instead put before the House an unreported bill making it impossible for those of us who believe the House should be bound by the rules it sets for itself to exercise those rights.

Mr. MCINNIS. Regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House has just adopted House Resolution 117.

Mr. McDERMOTT. It is my understanding that we went around the rules because we did not follow the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCINNIS. A point of order, Mr. Speaker, I thought it was a parliamentary inquiry, not a speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

#### HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. speaker, I ask unanimous consent all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995.